The Inquirer

THE UNITARIAN AND FREE CHRISTIAN WEEKLY · Founded 1842

REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER *No. 6059* *Saturday, August 23, 1958* *Price 3½d.*

THE REAL CRISIS

LAST week, the Master of Campion Hall, Oxford, the Rev. T. Corbishley, S.J., in an article in the *Sunday Times*, looked forward to a co-operation between theology and science. The article was an individual contribution to a series with the title, "The Destiny of Man". Much is heard about such possible co-operation today, more from the theologians than the scientists, for it is doubtful whether the scientists hold theology in such respect as the theologians now show towards science. The suggested co-operation is expected to take place at where the implications of moral behaviour can be discussed. Why do men behave decently or vilely; and how can they be persuaded always to act decently? This to any civilized man seems to be the dominant question of human survival.

The trouble is choosing and living the right ideal. One of the bravest acts recently carried out by men was taking the *Nautilus* under the North Pole. On any account it was a major act of civilization. Yet the *Nautilus* is hardly an angel of peace. It is designed with the highest reach of the human mind to slay people on a massive scale. The scientists usually ascribe moral conduct as action by men without necessarily a belief in God. The theologians think that sooner or later moral action is not possible without belief in God. And as an addendum to any possible co-operation it must be noted that presumably the theologians are not more or less concerned than the scientists about the voyage of the submarine.

The Division of Emotion

It is really about the word God that the division exists between the theologians and the scientists; and all argument or possible co-operation about morality is begging the question. They may talk as gentlemen together about the basis of good conduct, but they are hardly likely to talk as gentlemen about the religious experience entailed in the word God, for gentlemen do not talk about intimate emotional experiences. (And therefore gentlemen sometimes talk about nothing at all.) Religion, upon which theology is founded, is not *thought* about God in the first place, it is a deeply emotional experience, and unless it is that it is hardly worth writing about. Any thinking about God must be related at some point or other to feeling about Him. Presumably, the scientist does not share this; the Catholic priest does; so what are they going to co-operate about? Any talk above this level can be gentlemanly chit-chat. The real crisis between theology and science is that the theologian and scientist have nothing of any emotional significance to discuss between them. There is no sharing of ultimate experience, and to assume that some level of agreement can be reached without such a sharing is to ignore passionate disagreement underneath.

What Is Really Felt

Father Corbishley believes that on occasion God is literally present in a Catholic Church; that a communicant at a Catholic Holy Communion literally partakes of the nature of God. These are deep emotional experiences. Presumably they lie at the very heart of a Catholic's life. Yet these experiences cannot be shared by Sir Julian Huxley (with whom Father Corbishley was chiefly arguing in his article). At what point can co-operation take place? And if it cannot is there much point in trying to make out that there is no real division between science and theology?

The same division can be found outside the Catholic Church. In the Anglican Church the recital of the creeds is an act of an emotional nature. At least that is to be presumed. It is hardly possible for anyone to believe with any real intensity in the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ without being moved by it. Yet it is improbable that many people believing in a scientific explanation of man's destiny could enter into this particular experience.

It is well to bear in mind the nature of the division between theology and science. It is not one of abstract thinking or difficulties about moral conduct, it is one of emotional experience. This division may be hidden, and it is all too easily glossed over in the general effort to find agreement upon what is called man's moral nature. The real spiritual catastrophe that mankind is faced with is not that it cannot think together but that it cannot feel together. The Russian scientist presumably subjects himself to the same discipline of thought as the American, but who can really describe the emotional division between them?

The theologians have a far, far harder task on their hands than finding a co-operative sphere between theology and science, it is to find out the meaning of what emotionally is so important for them, and how it can be shared by others, and if it cannot be shared what is the reason—from theology's point of view. The innate sinfulness of man, or the designation of heretic, is hardly relevant today. The theologians sometimes give the impression that they hardly know yet the crisis that is upon them.

HAS LIFE A MEANING?

By Francis Terry

A GENERATION ago, a fashion set in among some intellectuals for sweeping away every idea of a unified meaning of life. The question, they said, was too general. Life was lived by separate individuals, and the meaning of each man's life was just whatever he chose to put into it. If his actions were inconvenient to other people, they might protest to him on practical grounds, or even refrain him by law. But they had no right to pass moral judgments of approval or disapproval. The man was simply getting what he wanted from life: there was no need to thank him for having nice desires; nor were you entitled to censure him for having nasty ones: it was his business, not yours. In this way, generosity and meanness, the serious and the trivial, the straight and the crooked, were all put upon the same level, as matters of personal taste, about which it was useless to argue.

As one side of the question, and a protest against errors of a contrary sort, this view had real merit. Before making generalizations, we have to start from the multitude of actual people, of all sorts and conditions, each of whom, by his way of living, expresses some rudimentary notion of what life is for. And there is a great deal to be said for protecting the genuine spontaneity of personal choice which lies behind these varied modes of life. If, for instance, men were all utter hyprocrites, not really desiring any of the things at which they pretened to aim, there would be no discoverable meaning in their lives. Nor would there be if men were all too slavish to dare to form independent wishes of their own. It is obvious that moral praise and blame do frequently exert a sort of pressure upon men, which produces hypocrisy and slavishness, until they find it difficult to admit, even to themselves, that what they really want from life is something different from what is offered by the accepted morality of their day. Or, conversely, they might be driven to blind revolt. Is there anyone whose nature is not to some extent scarred and warped by this sort of pressure? Surely it is good to get rid of it.

★

But it would be going too far if, in re-action against moral tyranny, men ceased altogether to pay regard to the impression their conduct made upon their neighbours, or themselves to feel any concern about the behaviour of others, or to join in discussing the differences which arise in these matters. Our whole sense of reality has been bound up, since infancy, with a constant comparison of our experiences with those of others. That is how we develop our sense of an external world, with matters in it of common concern, and distinguish these from mere fads and fancies and deceptive dreams. So also our sense of our own reality involves the expectation that people will show awareness when they encounter us: to be ignored is more disconcerting than to be hated. This need for recognition and comparison of experience affects us at the centre of our lives, and not only at the outer edges. A man demands that people take note of his creed: even if it is a philosophy of mere "live and let live", he expects his sincerity to be acknowledged, and to be answered either with agreement or with reasoned disagreement. In the ordinary texture of human intercourse we invite people to show interest in our attempts to find satisfaction in life, and are continually exchanging views about comparative merits of different aims and modes of behaviour. All this, if it is not just futile, implies belief in a common basis of comparison, some general overriding significance of human life, however variously and imperfectly discerned, we reach out to as an ultimate standard.

Through these exchanges of opinion, men do arrive at quite a large amount of agreement about the sorts of conduct which fit in with a true view of the meaning of life, and are usually conscious of living among publicly recognized moral realities as well as among the publicly recognized realities of the material world.

★

There is, however, a great difference in the sort of exchange of opinion which takes place, according to which aspect of reality is in issue. In ascertaining the truth about material things, we try to be impersonal, and eliminate the effects of individuality; we tell of seeing what anybody would have seen, and deducing what anybody would deduce; we do not have to enlarge our sympathies or improve our knowledge of one another. But, when discussion touches on the general meaning of life, it is impossible to be impersonal: we are dealing with men's self-determination and self-committal, the vital decision which each man must make individually, and no one else can make for him. To understand them, we have to enter into the situation of the particular man, so as to see how it is that he feels the attraction of certain aims and objectives and not of others. It is only when we have made contact with reality at this depth that we can profitably go on to compare impressions, and so advance to wider agreements and clearer general views.

This task of sympathy and mutual understanding is impeded by the tenacity with which everyone feels it necessary to insist upon the significance of his own life, and cling to the views which seem to him to support this. We thus carry with us too much luggage to be able to enter easily into another man's mind: its contents are arranged to show the significance of his life, not ours; it does not allow elbow-room for our sense of importance, and we cannot feel at home in it. In the consequent estrangement, the significance which the other man finds in his life begins to look like a threat to ours: we reply by trying to subject him to our own ideas, or to undermine his position by fault-finding and disparagement; or we seek to avoid the conflict of individual views by abjuring these and submitting together to the dictation of a tyrannous leader or group. These influences distort our whole moral life and darken the air with a fog of oppression and rancour. It is a process which, in the end, would leave us utterly sceptical of the meaning of life, with nothing to live for but casual desires, and wrapping ourselves up in material comforts.

★

It is wholesome, therefore, to acknowledge that, on the level of mere morals and fine human minds, the problem is insoluble. It is like some parts of mathematics, which cannot be put in order until we admit the idea of infinity. Men have always had some sense of a larger mind or life, with which they were intimately connected, but which reached out infinitely beyond them. This contact with something infinite in the depths of their own being assured them that their lives had a significance greater than they could yet grasp; and, by the same token, it taught to recognize the inner mystery in other people, and our ultimate union one with another. It is the business of theologians to give explicit shape to this apprehension of an infinite factor. Here it is sufficient to refer to it as the background of ethics, a common sky and sunlight giving unified perspective to the mixed details of our moral life.

THE HARVARD AFFIRMATIONS

By Arthur W. Vallance

THE students for the Unitarian ministry at Oxford and Manchester being, no doubt, fully occupied in important vacation pursuits, have not yet leapt to the challenge of Mr. Harry M. Stokes, of the Harvard Divinity School. It may not, therefore, be altogether unfitting for a minister whose college days are more than thirty years behind him to comment on the very interesting "Unitarian Christian Affirmations" so thoughtfully propounded for the consideration of English Unitarians.

In general I can accept all the Affirmations, though in some of them I think the wording could be made clearer. What about that word "redeeming" in No. 4, and "redemption" in No. 7? "Redemption" is a frequent word in Christian orthodoxy, but infrequent in Unitarian preaching, because it has been so mixed up with a hell-fire theology, or with a doctrine of the Fall of Man which is not part of Unitarian Christianity. So we do not speak of "the redemption

of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ", because that involves a picture which denies the religious universalism implied in Affirmation No. 7; but we can use the word for redeeming situations, in the sense that action can be taken to bring good out of evil. But orthodoxy still uses it to mean a transaction by which guilty people can be held innocent, and that will not do for us. When we are conscious of things we have done wrong, we do not ask for any process to obliterate our guilt for these actions; but we do seek release from the faults in ourselves which have made us do them, and that is how we interpret the Christian message of the sanctification of character.

Like the Editor, I find the most important part of the Affirmations at the beginning. I am not quite sure what is the intention of the sentence in No. 2, "destroying himself in alienation from God". It could be meant to imply the teaching of "conditional immortality" though this seems to be qualified by the sentences which follow. I am enough of a universalist to feel sure that if we believe in the God whom Jesus knew, His love and mercy will not be satisfied in the destruction of any human personality. Some way of "redemption" will be found.

Both the first and second Affirmations imply (without specifically stating) belief in that human immortality which Humanists have strongly denied. It is implied in the reference to the resurrection-experience in the first Affirmation. I agree with the Editor that we have something fresh here. Unitarians have generally been content to assert their belief in the "immortality of the soul" without referring it to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which they have been unable to accept as a historical physical event. Current orthodox theology is concerned to assert the Christian doctrine of "resurrection" over against the Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Has this influenced the Harvard statement? My own view is that if "resurrection experience" is to have a religious value for us, we must carefully separate it from any reference to the resurrection of the body. The New Testament experience was fundamentally a spiritual experience which could never have been guaranteed by a purely physical event. Also I am unable to say that the pervading New Testament preaching of the Risen Christ implies that humanity before the time of Jesus had no hope of "resurrection". Our "symbolic" acceptance of the New Testament resurrection experience must be that the life of Jesus was of such a character that we are assured of human spiritual possibilities, including the possibility of "overcoming the sharpness of death". Every great life makes some truths easier to believe, and some possibilities easier to realize. In this sense Jesus is seen in the pages of the New Testament to be a supreme Redeemer of Humanity from its doubts and fears, its powerlessness and its futility. We do well to hold on the assurance of nineteenth century Unitarians that the spiritual stature of Jesus is a powerful incentive to His disciples to continue individually and socially in attempting the redemptive things He did. "He who believes in me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do. . . ."

CHRISTIANITY'S MORAL DEFEAT

(The following is taken from the April issue of "World View", an American journal. It is taken from an article by Professor C. Wright Mills, of Columbia University. It is printed here as a point of view.)

If you, as Christian ministers, accept the entertainment terms of success, you cannot succeed. The very means of your "success" make for your failure as witnesses, for you must appeal to such diverse moral appetites that your message will necessarily be generalized to the point of moral emptiness. If you do not specify and confront real issues, what you say will surely obscure them. If you do not alarm anyone morally, you will yourself remain morally asleep. If you do not embody controversy, what you say will inevitably be an acceptance of the drift to the coming hell. . . .

Do not these times demand a little Puritan defiance? Do they not demand the realization of how close hell is to being a sudden and violent reality of man's world today? Should not those who still have access to the peoples of Christendom stand up and denounce with all the righteousness and pity and anger and charity and love and humility their faith may place at their command the political and the militarist assumptions now followed by the leaders of the nations of Christendom? Should they not denounce the pseudo-religiosity of men of high office who would steal religious phrases to decorate crackpot policies and immoral lack of policies? Should they not refuse to allow immorality to find support in religion? Should they not refuse to repeat the official, un-Christian slogans of dull diplomats who do not believe in negotiation, who mouth slogans which are at most ineffective masks for lack of policy? Should they not realize that the positive moral meaning of what is called "neutralism" lies in the resolve that the fate of mankind shall not be determined by the idiotically conducted rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union?

★

I do not wish to be politically dogmatic, but merely brief and, as you gentlemen surely have recognized, I am religiously illiterate and unfeeling. But truly I do not see how you can claim to be Christians and yet not speak out totally and dogmatically against the preparations and testing now under way for World War III. As I read it, Christian doctrine in contact with the realities of today cannot lead to any other position. . . .

There is no necessity for more military emphasis on missiles. There is no need for more "science" in education: it is not "realism" to spend more money on arms. Necessity and need and realism are the desperate slogans of the morally crippled. The necessity is for moral imagination. The need is for political new beginnings. Realism means to stop at once and if need be unilaterally all preparations for World War III. There is no other realism, no other necessity, no other need.

You will not find in moral principles the solution to the problems of war, but without moral principles men are neither motivated nor directed to solve them. But nowadays we pagans see that Christian morals are more often used as moral cloaks of expedient interests than ways of morally unclouking such interests.

War is not today inevitable; it is, immediately, the result of nationalist definitions of world reality, of dogmatic reliance upon the military as the major or even the only means of solving the explosive problems of this epoch of despair and of terror. And because this is now so, to lift up and to make knowledgeable the level of moral sensibility is the strategic task of those who would be at peace.

Your role in the making of peace is less the debating of short-run and immediate policies than the confrontation of the whole attitude toward war and the teaching of new views of it by using them in criticism of current policies and decisions. And in the end, I believe the decisive test of Christianity lies in your witness of the refusal by individuals and by groups to engage in war. Pacifism, I believe, is the test of your Christianity—and of you. At the very least, it ought to be *the* debate within Christendom.

The brotherhood of man is now less a goal than an obvious condition of biological survival. Before the world is made safe again for American capitalism or Soviet Communism or anything else, it had better be made safe for human life.

But you may say: "Don't let's get the church into politics". If you do say that, you are saying: "Don't let's get the church into the world; let's be another distraction from reality". This world *is* political. Politics, understood for what it really is today, has to do with the decisions men make which determine how they shall live and how they shall die. They are not living very well, and they are not going to die very well, either. Politics is now the locale of morality: it is the locale both of evil and of good. If you do not get the church into the moral issues of politics, you cannot confront

evil and you cannot work for good. You will be a subordinate amusement and a political satrap of whatever is going. You will be the great Christian joke.

☆

Men and ideas, the will and the spirit, are now being tested, perhaps in all truth for the final time; and in this testing so far, you Christians are standing in default. The key sign of this is the fact of your general lack of effective opposition, of your participation in the fact of moral insensibility. That, of course, is a world fact about publics and masses and *élite*, but it is all the more grievous among Christians, if only because of the expectations that they have aroused about themselves.

Yet who among you has come out clearly on the issues of internecine war and the real problems of peace? Who among you is considering what it means for Christians to kill men and women and children in ever more efficient and impersonal ways? Who among you uses his own religious imagination to envision another kind of basis for policies governing how men should treat with one another? Who among you, claiming even vague contact with what Christians call "The Holy Spirit", is calling upon it to redeem the day because you know the times are evil?

If you are not today concerned with this — the moral condition of those in your spiritual care — then, gentlemen, what is your concern? As a pagan who is waiting for your answer, I merely say: you claim to be Christians. And I ask: what does that mean as a biographical and as a public fact?

In moral affairs you are supposed to be among the first of men. No moral affair today compares with the morality of warfare and the preparation for it, for in these preparations men usurp — as you might say — the prerogatives of God. By sitting down and by keeping quiet, by all too often echoing the claptrap of the higher immorality that now passes for political leadership — you are helping to enfeeble further in this time of cruel troubles the ideals of your Founder. Christianity is part of the moral defeat of man today. . . .

I hope you do not demand of *me* gospels and answers and doctrines and programmes. According to your belief, my kind of man — secular, prideful, agnostic . . . is among the damned. I'm on my own; you've got your God. . . .

"UNITARIANISM IN THE UNITED KHASI-JAINTIA HILLS"

By Pliriad Lyngdoh

[The following article, preceded by a covering letter, comes from Shillong, the Khasi Hills, Assam. We have decided to print both as they stand.—Editor.]

Sir,—I am a young Unitarian boy by birth. This is the first time I pen article on paper. I would, therefore, be very glad if you please publish this short article in the next or any issue of *The Inquirer* (that will be issued soon). I am not well-educated and if any mistake, I may please be excused. If you find the number of words in the article exceeds what is needed for convenience, it may please be continued in the following issue.

Enclosed herewith is the said article, entitled "Unitarianism in the United Khasi-Jaintia Hills". I prepare this in spare time available and from my own observation of the facts and figures.

That is all now. I thank you very much. I also give my thanks to all Unitarians there.

Very sincerely yours,

Pliriad Lyngdoh.

UNITARIANISM came to be known here in the latter part of 1887 (that is on 18.9.1887). Now seven decades passed and the present number of followers appears to be constant or slightly increasing. Through the guidance of our parents and church elders, we try to lead our individual life and its duties up to the interest of Unitarianism. Young Unitarians today, though they are not educated, are growing up with a better understanding of what Unitarian way of life should be. They realize that through them God acts and speaks. It is of their own volition that souls proceed into heaven or hell. Broadly speaking, they realize that religion is the serious business of human life. We are also gaining knowledge of the position of Unitarianism in comparison with other creeds or churches here.

There are many people who realize the Unity of God and do their duties of life in a way consistent with the teachings of Unitarianism. But they do not know where such a religion that stands for Truth and Righteousness exists. They are Unitarians unknowingly. To live a Unitarian life it depends upon one's self-determination, will and personal character. But here it requires expansion and its gospel to be preached and extended to every nook and corner. Preaching our gospel is a part of work that remains to be done and it appears to be a difficult one for us. Other churches that come here strike deep roots in these Hills with an increasing strength because of their ability to send preachers everywhere. Our church has to all intents and purposes no preachers. This is the reason why we do not progress. The problem to spread our gospel by preaching depends upon circumstances around us as we have to move from place to place. Circumstances compel us to pay our whole attention to work for simple daily bread. "It is bread that millions . . . cry out with parched throats", says Vivekananda. We are put out to work from our very tender age toiling hard for daily manna. Thus the call of preaching is likely to fall upon deaf ears. And our voluntary work for the purpose is the subject matter of spare time.

Every year, we have our annual Youth Meeting in which we conduct services and preach sermons. In attending to such meetings, we have to work hard to meet our expenditure in the journey. The main problem responsible for all these difficulties of creating a preaching mission (to spread the Truth of Unitarianism) is prevailing poverty. In search of a good job, anyone among us whom we expect to lead us, may go far away from us and thus our strength may diminish. You see how poverty works and guides us. Poverty has no bar to happiness nor prevents us from becoming honest, pure and religious. But it compels us to stick to one particular work (of earning) and this is the main theme of life's story. As such we cannot but be satisfied with our services in our respective local churches.

As I see it, Unitarianism depends on its followers for its promotion and expansion. In some places people want it but cannot hold it as we have no preacher to strengthen or inspire it to others. However, we try to devote to this work of active organization by drawing plans and programmes. But here again besides the problem of expenditure in the journey, the distance from one church to another is another difficulty as most of us are government employees and daily wage-earners having a very little time to spare. Now in two or three villages there seems to be a possibility for our churches to disappear. What we want is to rejuvenate it with the voice of peace and benediction. Men are desperately wanted! — Men free from any other services and who have better security in life to perform the work . . . to spread and preach.

THE I.A.R.F. IN CHICAGO

By Arthur Peacock

I WRITE on the eve of the Chicago conference. Late evening today (August 8) the spacious vestibule of the Ada Noyes Hall seemed to have about it the atmosphere of a G.A. informal reception. A little earlier the European delegation had arrived. At times their crossing had not been too comfortable and they were a little weary after their coach journey from Montreal. Yet here they were eagerly greeting old friends and being engaged in keen conversation by Chicago friends anxious to make them at home and to know them.

The Secretariat think it likely that some six hundred people will attend the Congress. Let me mention some of the folk seen here already. The English party includes such well-known ministers as Kenneth Twiss, H. John McLachlan, F. Kenworthy, Wilfred Waddington, Shirrell Price, Bruce Findlow, and prominent laylolk like Margaret Bunill, Mar-

garet Stevenson, Miss Garry and Herbert Dove of Newcastle. Philip and Margaret Hewett, from Vancouver, have had hearty handshakes from many English friends while the veteran Kierkegaard, from Copenhagen, and his daughter, are renewing contact with folk from many lands. The Pastor took part in a conference at Starr Island before coming to Chicago and is thrilled because in his own country he has found an able young man to assist him on his ministerial tasks, and to ultimately succeed him. Georges Marschal is here from France and Dr. Bouvier from Switzerland. The latter will preach the Congress sermon in the Rockefeller Chapel on Sunday.

★

This year's theme, "The World's Religions Can Help the World's Needs Today", means that non-Christian leaders will be prominent in the proceedings. For some days now the Pakistani hat of K. B. Rhabbani Khan (Imam of the Woking Mosque, Surrey) has aroused interest on the Chicago Campus. Questioned by interested people as to who he is the cheerful Imam has described himself as "a Unitarian from Pakistan". A party of Shintoists from Seattle and San Francisco were among early arrivals while others expected soon include the saffron-robed Buddhist monk who directs the Buddhist Academy at Ceylon (some three hundred schools are under his direction), Mr. Das, Secretary of the Brahmo-Somaj, and a Swami of the Ramakrishna Order.

There is a crowded programme for the coming days. It includes business sessions of the I.A.R.F., luncheons and tours of the University. There will be five public meetings. On Sunday evening Dr. Wilhelm Pauck, of New York, speaks on Christianity; Sir Zafrulla Khan, eminent international jurist, speaks for Islam at the second meeting; on Wednesday, when Hinduism is the theme, two friends well known to *Inquirer* readers participate. Dr. John Lathrop presides and the lecturer is Dr. Kalidas Nag, of Calcutta University. The latter visited us in England just a few years back and spoke in our Churches at Cambridge and Wandsworth. Buddhism will find a notable spokesman in Hon Justice U Chan Htoon, of Burma. Mr. Htoon played an important role in the negotiations leading up to the establishment of the Burma Republic.

★

These five lectures will form the subject of group discussions each day and the leaders of the respective groups will make reports at a later stage in the proceedings.

Briefly, that's the programme for the next few days and on its eve the Congress is eagerly awaited.

A few of us were privileged to come in advance of the Congress. Two weeks ago Mr. Chuter Ede and his sister, K. B. Rhabbani Khan and I, arrived in Boston for a colloquium of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Rev. John Kielty, who had been at Starr Island, joined us for this two-day discussion which considered the possibilities of a common world ethic.

The American Academy is a body comparable in many ways to our British Association. Its headquarters are in a lovely house at Brookline on the outskirts of Boston. Its interior follows an Italian style and is rich in colour and craftsmanship. It was difficult to believe it had only been built fifty years.

★

At this colloquium we met, too, representatives of non-Christian faiths as well as several Jesuit priests, Liberal Christian ministers and University professors. Our host was Prof. Mather, a distinguished geologist, well known in the leadership of the World Y.M.C.A., and described by Mr. Chuter Ede as "the most Liberal Baptist since John Bunyan".

Those of us who were invited to Brookline enjoyed the experience greatly, not only for the discussions but for the individual contacts provided by the occasion.

In our days at Boston and again now at Chicago we have found our American friends persistent with questions about the Middle East. What will happen in Lebanon? How are we going to solve the refugee problem on Israel's borders? Is a third war inevitable? These questions have been put many times in restaurants, hotel lounges and other places where we have been. These problems are much more in the public mind here and one senses deep fear and anxiety. There have been peace meetings on the Campus and a demonstration about the Middle East is announced for early next week.

Certainly much is happening and is going to happen in the neighbourhood of the University of Chicago during these immediate days, and I am sure I shall have many interesting things to report when I write again.

COMMUNION

By Irvin Hodgson

THE Communion Service is one of the most intimate, helpful, and deeply-moving, yet, at the same time, one of the most widely-misunderstood of all our services. To many of us it is the highest possible form of worship; the peak or mountain-top of our religious life, from which we derive that which makes us, in our best moments, what we are. True, it does not make us "perfect", nor do we need to be "good" men and women before we can join in this lovely service. We do not even insist, as do some branches of the Christian Church, that you must be a member of the Church before you can share this service with us. It is open to all who feel the need or the desire to partake. Furthermore, it is simply because so many of us feel that "we are not good enough" that it is so vitally important to us.

In other words, it is a service, not for the saints, but for the sinners! Whatever may be your judgment of the standard of Christian living displayed by those who are communicants, it is certain that those standards would be much lower were it not for the Communion Service. This service helps us immeasurably to be *better* men and women than we could ever be without it.

Much of the misunderstanding comes from its association in people's minds with the idea of sacrifice. They think of it in terms which are largely unacceptable to the modern mind; in terms of a cannibalistic rite. It is true enough that it has been linked with the idea of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Jesus; the sentences are often used, "This is My body which is broken for you", when partaking of the bread, and, "This is My blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins", when sharing the cup. But let us state at once that this language, like so much religious language, is symbolic, and was never intended, originally, to be taken literally. The bread and wine remain bread and wine throughout and no single one of us would dream of assuming otherwise. Nevertheless, they symbolize for us the Principle of Sacrifice, without which nothing good and lasting has ever benefited mankind. In this service we remember the sacrifice of Jesus, as well as that of lesser souls who have been benefactors and saviours of mankind.

★

Therefore, the Communion Service is, in the first place, a service of remembrance; a remembrance of Jesus and His Passion, in which we humbly acknowledge Him as the Lord of Life. But it is even more than that. As we kneel and deliberately, of our own free will and volition, reach forth our hands to take the bread and wine, we are voluntarily acknowledging and accepting for our own lives, this eternal and divine principle of the Sacrifice of Self in the service of the Kingdom. In this most solemn act of our religious life we take this principle and make it our own; we renew our allegiance to that which was fundamental behind all that Jesus Himself was, said, and did. Just as the bread and wine, by the natural processes of digestion, become part and parcel of our physical bodies, so we seek to make this divine principle part of our spiritual natures. Thus it is a symbolic act; a feast not of the body, but of the spirit. We are dedicating ourselves, all that we have and are, and all that we ever hope to be, afresh, to the Christ-like way of life.

This service is a solemn act with us, not merely because of its associations, but because we truly realize what we are about. We are seeking a closer union with God, and with all that is pure and holy and lovely in thought, word and deed. It is made the more solemn because we are ourselves all too keenly aware of our own weakness and shortcomings. We know full well that, in spite of the help of God, we shall fail again, and have need to come back time and again for a similar renewing of our spiritual resources. We know, too, that these resources are available to all who will attune themselves to the God-head. If we were greater and better people than we actually are, one such act would suffice for the rest of our lives, but because of our weakness and frailty, we rejoice that we can come back as oft as we will, and find pardon and peace, strength and inspiration for the Way. We come, like the Prodigal, to find the Father awaiting us, to welcome, and with all the resources of His household ready to help and comfort us.

★

You and I, after all, are immortal spirits, inhabiting the flesh for a time and for a purpose. The body, as Paul reminds us, is the temple of that part of our being, the *real me*, which is of God. But because of the prominence we give to our material selves and to the material world in all our thinking, all too often the spirit is relegated to the background, and we need to be reminded frequently, of our real natures. Hence the need of worship, and of the Communion Service in particular. There is a sense in which the bread symbolizes the physical, material world in which we live, and in which the wine symbolizes the spiritual life. It is in this, one of the most ancient of all religious rites, that we take the symbolic bread and wine and seek to fuse both the elements they represent into one perfect being in our own personalities.

We seek to remember that Jesus did not originate this service; that at the Last Supper He was simply observing the ancient Feast of the Passover, for the service itself goes back, through many forms, into remote history, and is found in some form or other, in many of the ancient religions. But Jesus gave to it a new significance as He did with everything He touched and taught, and a fuller and deeper meaning than ever before.

Today, the Communion Service takes different forms in different denominations and in different churches, but it provides a memorable and a wonderfully inspiring experience for all who will approach it reverently, in humility, and with real understanding.

THE MINISTER

By Dr. Ford Lewis

(The following is taken from an address upon the life of the minister, delivered by Dr. Ford Lewis, an American Unitarian minister.)

CLEARLY, it is too much to expect over-extended ministers to exercise self-discipline in their own interest. A worldly-wise proverb declares that a competent physician never attempts his own treatment. For one thing, the minister is committed, by his choice of profession, to the principle of sacrificial living. For another, many ministers do not realize the extent of the problems that so profoundly affect them. "The evidence that perplexity and vagueness continue to afflict thought about the ministry", writes Dr. Richard Niebuhr, "is to be found today in the theological schools and among the ministers themselves. Some schools and some pastors are highly conscious of the problem; others are in a more difficult state because they have not realized the source of their perplexities".

However, suppose today's harassed minister knows what he is doing and professes to like to operate alone under a heavy work-load. He should be protected from his own folly, for he cannot do his best work under such conditions. The pace is too rapid, the life too strenuous. And congregations would do well to remember that whatever vows of poverty, charity and exhaustion the minister may have made, his wife and family have not necessarily made any such voluntary commitment at all, and their interests ought to be well and seriously considered. The responsibility for a remedy falls directly on the people in the parishes, and these concrete suggestions are offered as a skeleton outline which may be expanded into a programme of reform.

1. **Don't take your minister's work for granted.** Keep his morale up by giving him the recognition to which he is entitled. Recently a couple I have never seen before came in and asked for assistance in arranging a loan on their house which, after considerable time spent, I was able to give them. "You like to do this, I suppose", was the careless comment of one of the pair when our session had ended. Well, of course! Anyone likes to think he has been helpful, but don't assume that your minister works frenziedly over 70 hours a week for the sheer pleasure of it. He does it because he sees so much to do and simply doesn't know how else to get it done.

2. **Don't expect the impossible.** Be prepared to have your minister criticized by your friends outside the church. His unorthodox ideas on theology may antagonize the orthodox, his demands for justice and brotherhood in the community may arouse the anger of those who are still bound with the fetters of prejudice, and his rational, common-sense handling of a funeral service may offend the sensibilities of those who demand the full barbaric rites, with all its superstitions, hypocrisy and sentimentality. His qualities of candour and directness which alienate the tender-minded should be the very virtues that commend him to the liberal.

3. **Relieve your minister of all work a layman can do just as well.** This injunction should be interpreted broadly. Weddings, christenings, funerals, sermons, and sick calls for the most part — though not exclusively — counselling, and functions such as these will probably remain unique duties of the minister for a long time to come. Nor would any good minister want either to give them up or to be restricted to these. But there are dozens of other duties connected with church promotion, teaching, administration and finance which qualified laymen can do as well or better. I am firmly convinced that the sooner the average church organizes itself into working committees and gives every member a job and holds him accountable for it, the sooner it will cease to be an average church.

Our generation cries out for progressive spiritual and moral guidance now as never before. The people want it and the times demand it. But the leaders who should furnish it and are trying desperately to do so find themselves pinned under the claw of crisis, overwhelmed by their duties and distracted by dozens of details which others should be handling. Perhaps it is not always true that whatever helps a minister benefits his congregation, but we may safely assume that such is usually the case. And we know for certain that whatever depletes a minister's strength, vitiates his effectiveness and threatens his health, is detrimental to the entire church.

Positive reasons for increased lay participation and support are abundant and convincing. Ministers themselves are often at fault for not inviting it. Let ministers and congregations alike consider carefully — the (minister's) life they save may be their own.

From Margaret Barr

A correspondent sends us the following extract from a letter recently received from Margaret Barr.

". . . I have never been so sure that what I am doing is worthwhile. Some of the children now in the school I hope will be able to take over all the teaching in a few more years. That is my aim: to put all my work on a self-running and self-supporting basis before I have to lay it down. . . . The continuity of Liberal Religion will then be assured. Not that I think it would be greatly jeopardized even if some of the other non-Unitarian children had the running of it. They are becoming so imbued with the liberal

(Continued on page 276)

THE CALENDAR OF THE CHURCHES

SUNDAY, AUGUST 24, 1958

ABERDEEN, Unitarian Church, Shore Street, 11 and 6, Rev. W. B. TAYLOR
ABERYSTWYTH, New Street Meeting House, 11, Supply
ABERYSTWYTH, New Street Meeting House, 11, Rev. J. CEIRAN DAVIES
ALTRINCHAM, Dunham Road Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ARTHUR W. VALLANCE
ASHWORTH, Unitarian Church, Edenfield Road, 11.15 and 3, Rev. B. GILL
ASTLEY, Unitarian Chapel, Manchester Road, 6.30, Supply
BATH, Trim Street Chapel, Unitarian, 6.30, Mr. E. C. B. LEE
BELFAST, All Souls, Elmwood Avenue, 11.30 and 7, Dr. A. L. AGNEW
BELFAST, First Church, Rosemary Street, 11.30 and 7, Mr. WILLIAM MCMILLAN
BIRKLE GREEN (nr. Stevenson), Unitarian Church, 11, Dr. MORTIMER ROWE
BILLINGHURST, Free Church, High Street, 11, Rev. W. M. LORD
BIRKENHEAD, Unitarian Church, Bessborough Road, 6.30 (August 31), Rev. MAURICE JOHNSON
BIRMINGHAM, Church of Messiah, Broad Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GORDON STUART
BIRMINGHAM, Waverley Road Church, and Hurst Street Mission, Small Heath, 6.30, Mrs. E. SPICER
BLACKPOOL, North Shore, Dickson Road, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. E. A. WEST
BLACKPOOL, South Shore, Lytham Road, 11 and 6.30, Mr. FRANK LOWE
BOLTON, Bank Street, 2.30, Sunday School, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. S. H. BUTLER
BOLTON, Unity Church, Deane Road, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. ARTHUR J. LONG
BOLTON (LAND.), Unitarian Chapel, Spain Lane, 6.30, Rev. HENRY HALL
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Church, West Hill Road, 11, Rev. LAWRENCE REDFERN
BRADFORD, Broadway Avenue, 3.15, Mr. PETER TIMPSON
BRADFORD, Town Hall Square, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. FRANK A. BULLOCK
BRIDGWATER, Christ Church, Dampier Street, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Supply
BRIGHOUSE, Unitarian Chapel, 11, Rev. G. RANDALL JONES
BRIGHTON, Christ Church, Unitarian, New Road, 11 and 6.30, Mr. M. E. THORNECROFT
BRISTOL, Lewin's Mead Meeting, 6.30, Rev. DUDLEY RICHARDS
BRISTOL, Oakfield Road, 11, Rev. DUDLEY RICHARDS, 6.30, Mr. R. L. NICHOLSON
BURNLEY, Unitarian Church, Trafalgar Street, 3, Rev. L. HALLWORTH
BURY, Bank Street, 11, Rev. JOHN MATHER, 6.30, Rev. G. L. CLARKE
CAMBRIDGE, Memorial Church, Emmanuel Road, 11, Dr. E. A. WHEELEY
CARDIFF, The West Grove Unitarian Church, 6.30, Rev. ROY JOHN
CHATHAM, The Church of the Great Commission, Harwood Hill, 3, Rev. WILL HAYES
CHELTENHAM, Rendall Unitarian Church, Royal Well, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. J. M. QUIRK
CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Chapel, Trinity Street, 11, Miss MITCHAM, 6.30, Rev. L. A. GRIBBLE
CHESTERFIELD, Elder Yard Church, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. ERNEST SHAW
CHOWBENT Chapel, Atherton, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. KENNETH TOPPIN
COVENTRY, Great Meeting House, Hales Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. H. MORRIS
CREWE, Free Christian Church, Beech Street, 6.30, Supply
CRIEVEHOPE, Unitarian Church, Hermitage Street, 11, Rev. G. FELLOWS, 6.30, Mr. N. D. BLAKE
CROYDON, Free Christian Church, Wellesley Road, 11, Miss F. M. BUTCHER
DENTON, Wilton Street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. F. COTTER
DERBY, Friar Gate Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Supply
DITCHLING, Old Meeting House, 10.45, Miss H. K. WATTS
DONCASTER, Free Christian Church, Hall Gate, 11, Mr. S. B. SHEPHERD, 6.30, Dr. S. P. BOOTH
DOVER, Adrian Street, Unitarian Church, 11, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. PHILIP C. WHITEHEAD
DUBLIN, Stephen's Green, West, 11.30 and 7.30, Rev. E. SAVELL HICKS
DUDLEY, Old Meeting House, Wolverhampton Street, 11, Rev. E. BRABBURY-MARRIDGE
DUKINFIELD, Old Chapel, Chapel Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. H. K. STEPHENS
DUNDEE, Unitarian Church, 55 Constitution Road, 11, Rev. S. E. BROWN
EDINBURGH, St. Mark's Church, Castle Terrace, 11 and 6.30, Supply
EXETER, George's Chapel, South Street, 6.30, Rev. Dr. F. D. MAVOR-KELLETT
GEE CROSS, Hyde Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. HARRY SMITH
GLASGOW, St. Vincent Street, Unitarian Church, 11, Rev. JOHN CAVEHEAD
GLOSSOP, Tireplain Street, 2, Sunday School, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. W. H. CORDELL
GLOUCESTER, Barton Street, 3, Rev. J. M. QUIRK
GREAT YARMOUTH, Old Meeting (Unitarian) Church, Middlegate Street, 7, Supply
GUILDFORD, Ward Street Church, 11.15, No Services during August
HALE CHAPEL, Hale Barns, 10.45, Rev. S. MEDLEY, 6.30, Rev. T. W. ROBERTS
HALIFAX, Northgate End, 10.45, Rev. J. B. TOWERS, 6.30, Supply
HASTINGS, Free Christian Church, South Terrace, 11 and 6.30, Rev. DENISON HEATON
HINCKLEY, Great Meeting, Baines Lane, 11 and 6, Supply
HORSHAM, Worthing Road, 6.30, Rev. J. MARTYN HALL
HUDDERSFIELD, Paradise Street, 6.30, Rev. J. B. TOWERS
HULL, Park Street Church (Unitarian), 6.30, Rev. ERNEST PEEBLES
ISLE OF WIGHT, Newport, High Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. J. CARTER
KENDAL, Market Place, Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Rev. T. WARDLE
KIDDERMINSTER, New Meeting House, 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. HEATHMAN
KNUTSFORD, Brook Street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALBERT SMITH
LANCASTER, St. Nicholas Street Church, 6.30, Supply
LEEDS, Mill Hill Chapel, City Square, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. JOHN HOLROYD
LEICESTER, Narborough Road, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Mr. C. V. WALTON
LEICESTER, The Great Meeting, East Bond Street, 11, Mr. T. GREGORY, 6.30, Mrs. M. GREGORY
LITCHFIELD, Sandford, Miss J. E. LOMBAY, Killiney, Garth Road, 11, ——
LIVERPOOL, Assembly Chapel of Trinity, 11 and 6.30, Dr. P. N. THOMAS
LIVERPOOL, Renshaw Free Church, 11, Rev. NORMAN KIRKHAM
LIVERPOOL, Domestic Mission, Mill Street, 6.30, Supply
LIVERPOOL, Gateacre Chapel, 11, Supply
LIVERPOOL, Hamilton Road, Egerton, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. NORMAN KIRKHAM
LIVERPOOL, Hope Street, 6.30, Rev. C. A. PIPER
LIVERPOOL, Ullet Road, 11, Rev. C. A. PIPER, 6.30, Rev. J. E. MORRIS
LONDON, Ball Street, Edgware Road, 6, No Service
LONDON, Bloomsbury Mission and Stamford Street Chapel, 6.30, Rev. J. BOWLAND
LONDON, Brixton, Effra Road, 11, Rev. E. G. LEE
LONDON, Essex Church, Palace Gardens Terrace, Notting Hill Gate, 11, Rev. J. BOWLAND, 6.30, Miss JILL WATSON
LONDON, Forest Gate, Upton Lane, 6.30, Rev. WALTER M. L. LOSE
LONDON, Golders Green, Hoop Lane, 6.30, Rev. R. C. THATCHER
LONDON, Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Clarence Place, 6.30, Rev. RALPH E. GRIFFITHS (also 11, 1st Sunday in the month)
LONDON, Hampstead, Rosslyn Hill, 11, Rev. T. L. JONES
LONDON, Highgate Hill Unitarian Church, 11, Rev. R. C. THATCHER
LONDON, Hoxton, Hoxton Square, Pearson Hall, 6.30, No Service
LONDON, Kilburn Unitarian Christian Church, Quex Road, 11, Rev. A. V. FOX
LONDON, Lewisham Unitarian Church, High Street, 11, Rev. F. HOPKINSON
LONDON, Leytonstone, Lea Bridge Road, Eastlea Green, 6.30, No Service
LONDON, Mansford Street Church, Bethnal Green, 6.30, Mrs. E. SAVAGE
LONDON, Richmond Free Church, Ormond Road, 11, Rev. R. H. CORDIER
LONDON, Stratford, West Ham Lane, Unitarian Church, 11.30, Children's Church, 6.30, Rev. T. L. JONES
LONDON, Wandsworth Unitarian Church, East Hill, 11, Dr. ERNEST GREEN (also 6.30, 1st Sunday in the month)
LONDON, Welsh Unitarian Church at Highgate Hill Unitarian Church, 1st and 3rd Sundays, 6, Rev. T. L. JONES
LONDON, Wood Green, Unity Church, Newsham Road, 6.30, Rev. E. G. LEE
LYTHAM St. Annes (Ansdell), Channing Road, 11, Rev. W. A. M. HELLABY
MACCLESFIELD, King Edward Street, 10.45, Rev. C. D. POPPE, 6.30, Supply
MANCHESTER, Unitarian Church, Market Buildings, 6.30, Mrs. MURIEL HILTON
MANCHESTER, Blackley Unitarian Church, Chapel Lane, 6.30, Rev. DAVID C. DOEL
MANCHESTER, Cross Street Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Dr. R. W. WEBB
MANCHESTER, Gorton, Brookfield Church, Hyde Road, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. G. CARTWRIGHT
MANCHESTER, Monton Church, Eccles, 10.45, Rev. T. W. ROBERTS, 6.30, Mr. P. JONES
MANCHESTER, Pendleton Unitarian, Cross Lane, 6.30, Supply
MANCHESTER, Platt Chapel, Rusholme, 6.30, Mr. W. B. HARGREAVES
MANCHESTER, Renshaw Street Mission, 6.30, Rev. R. L. HOPKIN
MANCHESTER, Stand Chapel, Whitefield (August 31), 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. GRAHAM CARTWRIGHT
MANCHESTER, Wilbraham Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, 11, Mr. PHILIP M. BROWN
MANCHESTER, Wythenshawe, Unitarian Church, Brownley Road, Benchill, 6.30, Mr. MARSH
MANSFIELD, Old Meeting House, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. R. PLATT
MAPPLE, Unitarian Hall, 31 Stockport Road, 11 each Sunday
MERSEYSIDE, Free Christian Church, 6.30, Rev. E. A. DAVIES
MIDDLETON, Old Road Chapel, 3.15, Rev. DAVID C. DOEL
MIDDLETON-IN-TEESDALE, 3 and NEWTON ARNOT, 6.30, Rev. C. G. TOWSE
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, The Church of the Divine Unity, Ellison Place, 11 and 6.30, Mr. ALLEN KIRBY
NEWCHURCH (Rossendale), Bethlehem Unitarian Church, 2.30, Councillor Mrs. F. M. PROCTER, 6, Mr. J. SIMON
NORTHAMPTON, Kettering Road Church, 6.30, Mr. T. PATINALL
NORWICH, Octagon Chapel, Colegate, 11, Rev. J. A. KENNEDY
NOTTINGHAM, High Pavement Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. WINFRED BROWN
OLDBURY, Unitarian Church, Birmingham Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. HAROLD A. GIBBS
OLDHAM, Lord Street Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. T. E. NUTTALL
OXFORD, Manchester College Chapel, 11.30, No Service
PADIHAM, Nazareth Unitarian Church, Knight Hill, 10.30 and 6, Rev. L. HALLWORTH
PARK LANE CHAPEL, near Wigan, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GORDON BEVERLEY
PLYMOUTH, Unitarian Church, Notte Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. F. H. KERSLEY
POOLE, Unitarian Church, Hill Street, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Rev. J. W. DUNBLE
PORTSMOUTH, John Pounds Memorial Church, High Street, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Mr. J. R. STURGESS
PRESTON, Unitarian Chapel, Church Street, 6.30, Rev. W. A. M. HELLABY
RINGWOOD, Hanks, The Meeting House, 6.30, Rev. FRANCIS TERRY
RIPPONDEN CHAPEL, Nr. Horwich, Lancs., 3, Rev. R. I. PRITCHARD
ROCHDALE, Blackwater Street, 10.30 and 6, Rev. F. W. BAKER
ROTHERHAM, Church of Our Father, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. R. PHILLIPS
SALE, Ashfield Road, 11, Rev. JOHN GILL
SCARBOROUGH, Unitarian Church, Westborough, 6.30, Rev. W. T. WILKINS
SHEFFIELD (Attercliffe), 6.30, No Service
SHEFFIELD, Pullwood Old Chapel, 11, Mr. T. H. MORRIS
SHEFFIELD, Unity Church, Cranbrook Hall, 11 (only), Mr. ARNOLD GRAVES
SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11, Mr. H. BROADHEAD, 6.30, Rev. H. N. BACON
SHREWSBURY, High Street, Unitarian, 11 and 6.30, Supply
SHREWTON, Old Meeting, Unitarian, High Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. WHITAKER
SOUTHAMPTON, Church of the Saviour, London Road, 6.30, Mr. DAVID L. HOOD
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA, Dorothy Road, 6.30, Rev. F. G. GREEN
SOUTHPORT, Portland Street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. T. J. JONES
STOCKPORT, Unitarian Church, St. Peter's Gate, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. J. R. BLACKBURN
ST. HELENS, Corporation Street, 6.30, Mr. E. F. GORNEY
STOCKTON-ON-TEES, Wellington Street, 6.30, Rev. A. D. WILLIAMS (also 11, 2nd Sunday in the month)
STOURBRIDGE, Presbyterian Unitarian Chapel, 11, Rev. C. STEPHEN
SWANSEA, Unitarian Church, High Street, 6.30, Rev. B. VINEY (also 11, First Sunday in the month)
SWANSEA, Pentard Free Christian Meeting House, 11, Rev. B. VINEY
SWINTON, Station Hall Road, 2.30, Miss B. JOHNSON, 6.30, Supply
TAUNTON, Mary St. Chapel, 11, Supply
TOTTINGTON, Old Meeting House, Ashford Road, 6.30, Rev. G. KERRY
TORRINGTON, Unitarian Church, 10.45 and 6, Rev. ALEC L. FISHER
TORQUAY, Unity Church, Montpellier Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES EATON
TROWBRIDGE, Conigre Unitarian Church, 6, Mr. HUGHES
WARRINGTON, Cairo Street, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. ERIC WILD
WATFORD, Friends' House, Church Road (by permission), 7.30 (1st Sunday in the month)
WALLASEY, Memorial Church, Manor Road, 11, Rev. L. A. GRIBBLE, 6.30, Miss H. DIXON-WILLIAMS
WALSALL, Unitarian Free Church, Stafford Street, 11, Rev. R. J. WILLIAMSON, 2.30, Sunday School
WEST BROMWICH, Lodge Road, 11, Children's Church, 6.15, Rev. R. J. WILLIAMSON
WEST KIRBY, Brookfield Gardens, 11, Rev. MAURICE JOHNSON (also 6.30, 3rd Sunday in the month)
WHITBY, Flowergate, 6, Mr. E. E. STRACHAN
WILMSLOW, Dean Row, 10.45, Rev. PRIESTLEY PHILLIPS, STYAL, 6.30, No Service
YORK, St. Saviourgate Chapel, 6.30 (suspended during August)

The National Unitarian Fellowship provides for those unable to attend a Unitarian Church. For information write to the Secretary, N.U.F., 19 Gordon Sq., W.C.1.

AUSTRALIA

ADELAIDE, Unitarian Christian Church, Wakefield St., 11 and 7, Rev. CLIFF GOODWIN
MELBOURNE, Unitarian Church, Cathedral Place, C.2; Unitarian Half-Hour Broadcast, 4.15. Services: 4 p.m., second Sunday in each month, Evening 7 p.m., Rev. V. JAMES
PERTH, Western Australia, Unitarian Free Christian Fellowship, Rev. R. H. PARKINSON, 132 Duke Street, Southern Cross, West Australia
SYDNEY, New South Wales, Unitarian Church, 13 Francis Street (off College St.), 7.15, Rev. D. W. BARTLETT, Manse Telephone LX 5321
UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP OF AUSTRALIA, 1 Grote Alley, Melbourne, C.1. Minister: Rev. W. BUTTERSBY. Meetings as advertised.
STANFIELD CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, Annies Road, Stanford (Vic.) S.S. weekly at 2.15 p.m. Public Worship, fortnightly, 3.15 p.m. Minister: Rev. W. BUTTERSBY

CANADA

MONTREAL, Church of the Messiah, Sherbrooke Street West and Simpson Street, 11, Rev. ARNOLD CARMICHAEL
TORONTO, First Unitarian Church, 175 St. Clair Avenue West, 11, Rev. W. P. JOHNSON
VANCOUVER, B.C., Unitarian Church of Vancouver, 1,550 Tenth Avenue West, 11, Rev. A. P. HEWITT

NEW ZEALAND

AUCKLAND, Unitarian Church, Ponsonby Road, 11 and 7, Mr. M. J. WILSON
WELLINGTON, Service suspended — Enquiries — Mrs. WILSON. Tel. 46-272

SOUTH AFRICA

CAPE TOWN, Hout Street, 11, Sunday School, 7, Service, Rev. MAURICE C. RAITH

THE LINDSEY PRESS

Fifteen leaflets in the series PERSONAL TESTIMONIES "What Unitarianism Means to Me" have now been issued. The format is threefold, with an illustration on the front cover which is printed in two colours; the back page is left blank so that local material can be printed if required. They are issued anonymously under headings: By a Housewife and Mother, a Solicitor, a Musician, a Seaman, an Author, and so on. There are fifteen in all; the cost is 2d. each, the set of fifteen, post free, for 2s. 6d.

Eight three-fold leaflets, printed on tinted paper on such subjects as **Unitarianism and Science, A Unitarian View of Jesus, Unitarians and the Home, Outside the Church.** These cost **1d. each,** the set of eight, post free, for **8d.**

Also Three Publicity Cards, **The Principles of Unitarianism, Our Faith and Fellowship, Our Religious Faith. 1d. each.**

All the above should prove most useful for your Autumn Publicity Work.

THE LINDSEY PRESS
15 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

ADVERTISEMENT RATES
Births, Marriages, Deaths, Changes of Address
2 lines, 6s. 6d. minimum. Each additional line, 2s. 6d.
Miscellaneous — Prepaid
6d. per word, minimum 6s.
W. Heffer & Sons Publishing Organisation Limited,
Kingsgate House, 115, Hobson, London, W.C.1.
Telephone: CHAncery 8732
Display Rates on Application Special Terms for a Series

Marriage

Duke—Procter—On August 16 at Bethlehem Unitarian Church, Newchurch-in-Rossendale, Karl Heinz Duke, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Karl Herzog, of Glatz, to Sheila, daughter of Mr. and Councillor Mrs. Leslie Procter, of Willow House, Waterfoot, Rossendale.

Mr. Ronald Jones

We are informed on going to press that Mr. Ronald Jones, the Treasurer of the General Assembly, who met with a serious accident in Cambridge a fortnight ago, is progressing as well as can be expected.

THE INQUIRER

All letters and manuscripts for the Editor must reach the Office not later than Monday morning for publication the same week. All communications must be accompanied by the name and address of the sender.

Subscription Rates: £1 3s. 10d. per annum (post free).

Those having any difficulty in obtaining copies of the paper should communicate direct with the publisher.

Address: 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.
TEL.: EUS. 7354 Editorial: EUS. 2912

(*Continued from page* 274)

approach, and so sure that this is also the 'basic' approach, that I do not think they would try to spoil that side of the work of the school. Still, it would be good, for every reason, to have a Unitarian in charge.

"The present batch are doing splendidly, as also are the ones who finished their schooling before I went home. Of these, Bill is doing a good job running a Junior Basic School in the next village from here, and the three girls are working hard as village midwives. They are taking turns to be here to work with the older and more experienced woman I have in charge of the clinic, while the other two run a new little branch centre about three miles away. . . .

"It all takes time, but it is really astonishing how much progress we have made since the time that Bruce Findlow was here."

Correspondence

Letters should be addressed to the Editor, "The Inquirer", 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C. 1. They should not in general exceed three to four hundred words in length.

From The International Friendship League

SIR,—During the week of September 28-October 4, the International Friendship League is sponsoring throughout Britain a "People to People" week.

To be a stranger in a foreign country can be a very lonely experience. The aim of the People to People week is to provide opportunities for the general public to join in acts of goodwill towards overseas visitors and exiles in our country.

Many national organizations, including the National Council of Social Service, the British Council, the United Nations Association, East and West Friendship Council, will be associated with the week.

A special programme of international activities is being arranged throughout Britain, and it is hoped that civic heads will officially sponsor the week in their town.

In additional to special international programmes which will be arranged, the emphasis of the week will be on individual hospitality: week-end, overnight, invitations to meals, coffee evenings, visits, etc., provided by British families.

Clergy and ministers might like to write on People to People week to urge in their parish magazine and, nearer the date, in sermons the tremendous opportunity that now exists for ordinary families to play a part in world understanding by getting to know people of overseas origin living around them.

Further details of the work can be obtained from the League's office.

We wholeheartedly commend to you the idea of this week of international friendship throughout Britain.—Yours,

Leonard Birmingham, Trevor Huddleston, C.R., Donald O. Soper, Reginald Sorensen, Vice-Presidents.

William McLean

The very unexpected death of Mr. William McLean at the age of 75 deprived the congregation in Dundee, and Unitarianism in Scotland, of a very staunch supporter.

A craftsman in wood, he and his brothers conducted a very successful business, and produced household accessories of a very high standard.

He was a life-long Unitarian, and at one time and another held all the major offices of the church. He had been for many years a trustee and secretary of the committee and congregation. He was held in very high respect by all, and his wise guidance held the congregation happily together and this was very marked in recent difficult times. Nothing cheered him more than the evident renewed loyalty and enthusiasm for the present time.

The service at the Crematorium and the Memorial Service on Sunday, August 10, were conducted by the Rev. S. Evans Bowen, A.M.A.

Clough Noble

The congregation of the Pudsey Unitarian Church has suffered a grievous loss by the sudden death of Mr. Clough Noble, which took place on Tuesday, July 29. Mr. Noble, who was 73, was a member of a family which has loyally served the cause at Pudsey for nearly a century, his father and mother being the first couple to be married in the present building ninety-two years ago.

A trained baritone singer and an amateur actor of considerable ability, Mr. Noble used his talents to benefit the spiritual and social life of the congregation. He served on the Church Committee for many years, and several times occupied the presidential chair. But his special interest was in the choir, of which he was a member for nearly sixty years, singing in his accustomed place only two days before he met his death. Outside his church interests, he used his musical talents to assist local choral societies. He was a lover of nature and a keen gardener, and his end came as the result of an accident following a journey undertaken in search of new varieties for his rose garden.

A large and representative congregation gathered for the funeral service early on Saturday, August 2, which was conducted by his nephew, the Rev. Dr. Philip Noble Tindall, of the Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, Liverpool, with his daughter-in-law, Mrs. Ernest Noble, at the organ. P. N. T.

Printed by Waterlow and Sons Ltd., Queen Road, Southend-on-Sea and Published by The Lindsey Publications Co., Ltd., at the Temporary Office, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1.—Manchester (Wednesday) Joint Meeting, Thursday, Sunday, August 21, 1958